



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,228	11/14/2001	Raymond J. Mueller	00-106	8478
22927 7590 07/18/2008 WALKER DIGITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC 2 HIGH RIDGE PARK STAMFORD, CT 06905				
EXAMINER				
RETTA, YEHDEGA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,228

Applicant(s)

MUELLER ET AL.

Examiner

Yehdega Retta

Art Unit

3622

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 7, 9 and 11-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 7, 9 and 11-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/02)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/23/08

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive amendment filed April 23, 2008. Applicant amended claims 6 and 7. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 11-35 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claim recites training offer generation system within a first environment; analyzing the first environment to identify particular characteristics; identify a second environment which has characteristics similar to the particular characteristics of the first environment and applying the trained offer generation system to the second environment.

The specification teaches as follows:

In step 610, the server 24 trains the genetic programs stored by the server 24 based on the results of the whether the offer was made by the cashier, accepted by the customer or rejected by the customer (e.g., the server 24 "distributes the reward"). Exemplary reward distributions are described in more detail in Appendix B. In step 611, the process 600 ends. As with the XCS techniques described with reference to FIG. 4 and Appendix A, new genetic programs may be created using crossover, replication and mutation processes. For example, a new population of genetic programs (e.g., offspring genetic programs) may be generated by "mating" (e.g., via crossover) two genetic programs, by replicating an existing genetic program and/or by mutating an existing genetic program or offspring genetic program. Selection of parent" genetic programs may be based on, for example, the success (e.g., "fitness" described in Appendix B) of the parent genetic programs"

The specification however does not teach analyzing a first environment to identify particular characteristics and identify a second environment which has characteristics similar to the particular characteristics of the first environment and applying the trained offer generation system to the second environment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fayyad et al. (US 6,643,645).

Regarding claim 34, Fayyad teaches initializing an offer generation system, the offer generation system comprising at least one of a genetic algorithm or a genetic program to generate offers; establishing a threshold criteria for activation of the offer generation system; running the offer generation system as a background process in a given environment, whereby the offer generation system is trained to make offers in the given environment; and the offer generation system automatically self activating, in response to detecting the threshold criteria is met (see fig. 3-6, col. 2 lines 57-67, col. 5 lines 13-63, col. 6 line 13 to col. 7 line 46).

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Bieganski et al. (US 6,412,012).

Regarding claim 35 Bieganski teaches initializing an offer generation system, the offer generation system comprising at least one of a genetic algorithm or a genetic program to generate offers; establishing a threshold criteria for activation of the offer generation system; running the offer generation system as a background process in a given environment, whereby the offer generation system is trained to make offers in the given environment; and the offer generation system automatically self activating, in response to detecting the threshold criteria is met (see fig 12-14, col. 19 line 1 to col. 20 line 64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, and 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (US 6,397,193) in view of Bieganski et al. (US 6,412,012).

Regarding claims 1, 6, 7, 12 and 26, Walker teaches method comprising of receiving an order information based on order of a customer; determining an offer based on round-up amount; outputting an indication of the determined offer; displaying the offer (see fig. 10-13, col. 12 lines 20-35). Walker does not explicitly disclose offer based on genetic program or algorithm.

Bieganski teaches recommendation provided using genetic algorithm, collaborative filtering, neural networks or other statistical models (see abstract, col. 3 lines 19-58, col. 7 lines 45-64, col. 10 lines 17-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use genetic program or algorithm, as in Bieganski, to recommend items that are more compatible with other purchases or recommendations, as taught in Bieganski (col. 19 line 1 to col. 20 line 64). Bieganski also teaches displaying an offer to the customer via a display (see col. 7 line 65 to col. 8 line 14).

Regarding claim 9, Walker teaches receiving order information based on an order of a customer; determining a transaction total based on the order; calculating a difference between the total and a next highest dollar amount; determining an offer for the customer based on the difference (see fig. 10-13, col. 12 lines 21-67, col. 13 line 40 to col. 14 line 67). Walker does not teach use of genetic program or algorithm to determine the offer. Bieganski teaches recommendation provided using genetic algorithm, collaborative filtering, neural networks or other statistical models (see abstract, col. 3 lines 19-58, col. 7 lines 45-64, col. 10 lines 17-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use genetic program or algorithm, as in Bieganski, to recommend items that are more compatible with other purchases or recommendations, as taught in Bieganski (col. 19 line 1 to col. 20 line 64).

Regarding claim 11, Walker does not explicitly teach determining an amount of sales tax associated with the transition and the determining the offer is based on the amount of sales tax. Official notice is taken that is old and well known to first add the sales tax before determining the total tax if sales tax is applicable to the sale. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to know that, if sales tax is applicable to the Walker's transaction, that the total amount would be determined after the sale tax is added to the transaction.

Regarding claims 13, Walker teaches determining a transaction total based on order transaction; receiving an indication of acceptance of the offer; generating new order information representing at least one additional product being added to the order information; determining a new transaction total based on the new order information and outputting an indication of the new transaction total (see fig. 10-13, col. 12 lines 21-67, col. 13 line 40 to col. 14 line 67)

Regarding claims 14-23, Walker does not teach determining an offer based on historical offer criteria or generating a plurality of genetic programs and each genetic program is given an opportunity to generate at least one outcome; selecting the program at random; generating a set of rules based on historical information and creating new rules based on feedback; determining score etc. However those features are inherent feature of Genetic programming. Genetic Programming, which is an extension of Genetic Algorithm (GA), uses analogies from natural selection and evolution. The main difference between them is the solution encoding method. GA encodes potential solutions for a specific problem as a simple population of fixed-length binary strings named chromosomes and then applies reproduction and recombination operators to these chromosomes to create new chromosomes. GP encodes multi potential solutions for specific problems as a population of programs or functions. The programs can be represented as parse trees, of internal nodes and leaf nodes (or primitive functions and terminals). The terminals can be viewed as the inputs to the specific problem. They might include the independent variables and the set of constants. The primitive functions are combined with the terminals or simpler

function calls to form more complex function calls. For instance, GP can be used to evolve new rules from general ones. GP randomly generates an initial population of solutions. Then, the initial population is manipulated using various genetic operators to produce new populations. These operators include reproduction, crossover, mutation, dropping condition, etc.

Regarding claims 24 Walker does not explicitly teach displaying the offer via a display at a retail store. Bieganski teaches displaying the offer to the customer via a display at a retail store; wherein the offer is for at least one food item (see col. 7 line 65 to col. 8 line 14). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to put the offer on display so that the shopper and the cashier would be able to be informed about the offer.

Regarding claim 25, Walker does not explicitly teach the store comprising of quick service restaurant. However official notice is taken that is old and well know in the art of fast food (quick service restaurant) to offer an additional item to a customer based on his/her purchased items, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an offer using genetic programming as in Bieganski in a quick service restaurant in order to optimize the outcome.

Claims 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bieganski et al. (US 6,412,012) in view of Ross (US 6, 477,571).

Regarding claims 27 and 33, Bieganski teaches receiving order information based on an order of a customer; and generating an offer for the customer and outputting the generated offer. Bieganski teaches recommendation provided using genetic algorithm, collaborative filtering, neural networks or other statistical models (see abstract, col. 3 lines 19-58, col. 7 lines 45-64,

col. 10 lines 17-49). Bieganski does not teach the genetic program or algorithm includes translating the order information to a bit stream; generating the offer based on genetic program or algorithm comprising matching the bit stream to one or more classifiers of a population of classifiers; Ross teaches translating order information (transaction) to bit stream (alphanumeric string) and matching the bit stream to a classifiers. Ross teaches a service request string representations are passed to a transaction analyzer which first matches each service request to a service request identifier in a service request table that is used to store identifications of all service requests. Ross teaches each service request is represented by its request identifier obtained from the service request table 58, thereby providing a more compact and simpler service request representation (see col. 1 line 38 to col. 4 line 44, col. 6 lines 38-59). Ross also teaches the bit stream and classifier is a uniform length (see col. 4 lines 10-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bieganski recommendation system using Ross's translation system in order to express the transactions in simple and precise format and also to predict additional transaction occurrence, as taught in Ross.

Claims 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bieganski et al. (US 6,412,012) in view of Ross further in view of "Generalization in XCS", Stewart W. Wilson, submitted to ICML '96 Workshop on Evolutionary Computing and Machine Learning (herein after Wilson).

Regarding claim 28-32 Bieganski/Ross does not teach determining that a minimum number of classifiers of the population of classifiers has not been matched; generating one or more additional classifiers; and adding the additional classifiers to the population of classifiers,

in response to determining that the minimum number of classifiers has not been matched; said additional classifiers are generated through at least one of crossovers of existing classifiers or mutations of existing classifiers; determining whether to perform an exploit operation or an explore operation in selecting a classifier to make an offer; in which in response to determining that an explore operation is to be performed, the given classifier is selected at random, it is taught in Wilson (see par. 3.1, 5.0, 5.1). Wilson teaches classifier system in which fitness is based on prediction accuracy which increases the proportion of the population that consists of accurate classifiers at the same time reducing the total number of classifiers. Wilson also teaches in the exploit mode the system seeks the action for which the predicted payoff is highest (best classifier). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Wilson classifier system in Ross's classifier to derive accuracy from a prediction of error and fitness.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The amendment to claims 6 and 7 overcomes the objection. Therefore, the objection is withdrawn.

In regard to the rejection of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, applicant states that the specification on page 21 line 24 describes abstracting various characteristics in one environment (e.g., particular buying habits and tendencies) and adapting the knowledge learned/gained to other environments. Examiner agrees with applicant however disclosing "abstracting various characteristics in one environment (e.g., particular buying habits and tendencies) and adapting the knowledge learned/gained to other environments" does not equate to applying an offer

generation system within a first environment; training the offer generation system within the first environment to create a trained offer generation system which is optimized for use in the first environment; *analyzing the first environment to identify particular characteristics; identifying a second environment which has characteristics similar to the particular characteristics; and applying the trained offer generation system to the identified second environment.* Therefore, the rejection is appropriate.

Regarding claim 34, applicant argues that the invention recites establishing a threshold criteria for activation of the offer generation system wherein it is automatically self activating in response to detecting the threshold criteria is met. Applicant states in Fayyad, the prediction analysis performed by the recommender occurs regardless of whether or not the amount of data from the database is reduced. Therefore, in Fayyad, "establishing a threshold criteria" is not "for activation of the offer generation system" as recited in the claim.

Examiner would like to point out that a "threshold" according to applicant disclosure is a condition set for providing an offer (see [0043]). Applicant's specification teaches "each "classifier" comprises a "condition and an "action" that is similar to an "if—then" rule. That is if the condition is met (e.g., certain items are ordered in a certain day, at a certain time, by a certain customer, etc.), then the action is performed (e.g., a customer is offered an upsell offer, a dynamically-priced upsell offer, a suggestive sell offer, a switch-and-save offer, a cross-subsidy offer or any other offer". Regarding the running of the offer generation system (comprises of genetic algorithm or a genetic program) as a background, the specification teaches that the process 400 or 600 initially may be run in the background at a store or restaurant to "train" the server 24... the system may then indicate that it is ready to operate and/or turn itself on.

Fayyad also teaches reducing data until a predetermined accuracy threshold or predetermined performance requirement is met then the reduced data is provided to the recommender system which generates prediction based thereon, and based on query (see col. 1 lines 47-63). Fayyad also teaches providing a recommendation if a condition is met (activation of the offer generation system). Fayyad teaches data organized with rows and columns and each data point within the data may correspond to whether the user has purchased particular product or have not purchased the product (same as applicant's condition or "threshold"). Further Fayyad teaches the recommender loading all the data with the database that is needed for analysis an offer generation system trained to (self activate) provide offer when condition is met. Further Fayyad teaches the data provided to the recommendation system so the system can generate recommendations based on a query provided (1st condition met) and as well as on the data reduced (2nd condition). Fayyad teaches where the records correspond to users and the dimensions corresponds to individuals web sites (e.g., a binary yes or no as to whether a given user has visited a particular web site), then a query may be those web sites already visited by a user such that the predictions are those web sites that the user may also likely visit too (see col. 8 lines 29-44).

Regarding claim 35 applicant argues that Bieganski does not teach applying and training an offer generation system in first environment and identifying a second environment with similar characteristics. Examiner would like to point out that according to applicant "abstracting various characteristics in one environment (e.g., particular buying habits and tendencies) and adapting the knowledge learned/gained to other environments" is the same as "applying and training an offer generation system in first environment and identifying a second environment

with similar characteristics". Bieganski also teaches that the recommendation system used in on-line for recommending books is also adapted to provide support for human sales staff in suggestive selling in a call-center; at a cash register check-out system; recommending music, e.g., on-demand music system, or cable-TV music request services, entertainment services, financial service etc., (see col. 19 line 19 to col. 20 line 9).

Regarding claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 11-26, applicant argues as follows:

"The American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 amended 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) to state that art which qualifies as prior art only under § 102(e), (f) or (g) is not available for rejections under § 103 if that art and the subject matter of the application under examination were owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee at the time the invention was made. This change to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) is effective for any application filed on or after November 29, 1999.

The present application is an application for patent filed after November 29, 1999. At the time the invention was made, the subject matter of present application and the Walker patent were both owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee, Walker Digital, LLC, Stamford, CT, as evidenced by the assignment for the present application recorded in the PTO at reel 012804, frame 0517, and the assignment for the Walker patent recorded in the PTO at reel 010648, frame 0653. Therefore, Walker is not available as prior art for rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103."

However as indicated in the Reel/Frame 012804/0517 the present applicant was assigned to "WALKER DIGITAL LLC" on April 18, 2002 and the present applicant was filed on November 14, 2001. The patent (6397193) was assigned to "WALKER ASSET MANAMEMENT LIMITED PARTNERSHIP" ((as indicated in Reel/Frame 008946/0295) on January 22, 1998 and to "WALKER DIGITAL LLC" (as indicated in Reel/Frame 010648/0653) on November 30, 1999. As indicated by the Reel/Frame the present application and the patent were not owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee *at the time of the invention was made.*

Regarding claims 27 applicant argues that neither the service request identifier nor the regular expression comprises "a condition and an action to perform if the condition is met". Further, Applicant also argues that Bieganski and Ross taken alone or in combination do not teach at least the features "determining one or more expected rewards for each matching classifier" and "selecting a given classifier to make the offer, the given classifier comprising a given action". Examiner disagrees. Bieganski teaches providing a recommendation when a condition is met; generating an offer based on an algorithm and outputting the offer ((see abstract, col. 3 lines 19-58, col. 7 lines 45-64, col. 10 lines 17-49).

According to applicant's specification classifier for example is as follows:

Example of a Classifier:

0#011#01##000011#1→011010

The condition (the let-side of the arrow) could translate to something like "If its Thursday or Tuesday at noon and the order is a Big Mac and Soda."

The action (the right-side of the arrow) could translate to something like "Offer an ice cream cone."

CLASSIFIER MATCHING

It was stated above that the population of classifiers is searched for classifiers that match the input. How does a classifier match an input? First, the input from the environment (like Big Mac and Coke) is encoded as a string of 0's and 1 's. A classifier is said to match an input if: 1. The condition length and input length are equal 2. For every bit in the condition, the bit is either a # or it is the same as the corresponding bit in the input. For example, if the input is "Thursday, noon, Big Mac, Soda" then there might be a classifier that has a Don't Care for the day of the week. If there is such a classifier then it would match the input if it also has "noon, Big Mac, Soda" in the condition.

Therefore, classifiers are also bit stream for setting the "if-then" condition. As indicated above Bieganski teaches the "if-then" condition or rules to offer or recommend items (see col. 7 line 56 to col. 7 line 67). Bieganski also teaches the rules generated automatically by a process including but not limited to machine learning and statistical analysis processes such as genetic

algorithms. Bieganski failed to teach translating order information to bit stream. Ross teaches translating order information (transaction) to bit stream (alphanumeric string) and matching the bit stream to a classifiers. Ross teaches a service request string representations are passed to a transaction analyzer which first matches each service request to a service request identifier in a service request table that is used to store identifications of all service requests. Ross teaches each service request is represented by its request identifier obtained from the service request table 58, thereby providing a more compact and simpler service request representation (see col. 1 line 38 to col. 4 line 44, col. 6 lines 38-59).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yehdega Retta whose telephone number is (571) 272-6723. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YR

/Yehdega Retta/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622